For the Northern District of California

24

25

26

27

28

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8		Era (Bis	
9			
10	AMANDA FRLEKIN, et al.		
11	Plaintiffs,		No. C 13-03451 WHA
12	v.		No. C 13-04727 WHA
13	APPLE, INC.,		
14	Defendant.	/	ORDER RE CONSOLIDATION OF CASES AND REQUESTING SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING
15			
16	TAYLOR KALIN,		
17	Plaintiff,		
18	V.		
19	APPLE, INC.,		
20	Defendant.		
21		/	
22	Defendant Apple, Inc., has move	ed to conso	olidate the Frlekin and Kalin actions. Counse
23			

Defendant Apple, Inc., has moved to consolidate the Frlekin and Kalin actions. Counsel in the Frlekin action do not oppose this motion, and counsel in the Kalin action have yet to file an opposition or a notice of non-opposition.

Courts have "broad discretion" in deciding whether to consolidate separate actions. Investors Research Co. v. United States Dist. Ct. for the Cent. Dist. of Cal., 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989). In exercising this discretion, the Court "weighs the saving of time and effort

consolidation would produce against any inconvenience, delay, or expense that it would cause
Huene v. United States, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984).

Consolidating the *Frlekin* and *Kalin* actions would result in six different plaintiff law firms representing plaintiffs in a single action. This would require considerable effort to craft a consolidated complaint. Moreover, if the proposed consolidated action were to proceed as a class action, the requests for reimbursement of costs and attorney's fees from the six law firms would undoubtedly deplete the recovery for the putative class. An alternative is to select a smaller group of plaintiffs and firms, perhaps one each, to proceed on a possible class basis, with all others to proceed on an individual basis.

All counsel for all parties shall please submit memoranda commenting on the foregoing, as well as which, if any, counsel should possibly be appointed as interim class counsel. The memoranda should also address if one plaintiff is allowed to proceed as a putative class representative, who it should be. This is due by **Thursday**, **January 9**, **2014**, **AT NOON** and is limited to seven pages per submission. Finally, all parties shall also advise the Court as to any related actions elsewhere in the United States.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 6, 2014.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE